



The Center for Cleveland

November 4, 2025

The Honorable Sean Duffy  
Secretary of Transportation  
U.S. Department of Transportation

The Honorable Bernie Moreno  
United States Senator

The Honorable Jon Husted  
United States Senator

The Honorable Shontel M. Brown  
United States Representative

Mr. Bryan Bedford  
FAA Administrator

Mr. Daniel J. Edwards  
FAA Associate Administrator for Airports

**Re: Cleveland Burke Lakefront Airport Should Remain Operational**

Dear Secretary Duffy, Senator Moreno, Senator Husted, Representative Brown, FAA Administrator Bedford, and FAA Associate Administrator for Airports Edwards:

Cleveland Burke Lakefront Airport is a critical economic and aviation asset and should not be closed. Moreover, no airport that serves the national interest and benefits the flying public should be closed simply because the current mayor who controls the airport just wants it closed, and, in Cleveland's case, lacks an understanding of the role of the airport and publicly releases disingenuous studies that are aligned to his interests and lack full analysis.

This letter was prompted by Cleveland Mayor Justin Bibb's letter, co-signed with Cuyahoga County Executive Chris Ronayne, of October 22, 2025 (attached herein) requesting federal "partnership and support" and "explicit Congressional authorization" to close Cleveland Burke Lakefront Airport (BKL). Bibb is aware of the "loophole" of how to bypass the typical way to close an airport which is after Federal grant expiration and through FAA approval following an FAA analysis and obtaining FAA Associate Administrator for Airports concurrence, so he is pursuing a workaround: get Congress to create a law directing the FAA to allow or order closure.

**Burke's Capabilities**

1. Cleveland Burke Lakefront Airport (BKL) is a significant airport capable of serving any 737-series or A320-series aircraft. Larger, Boeing 757s regularly use the airport as well from charters to President's Trump's personal 757 when he landed at BKL when attending the RNC in Cleveland

in 2016. In other words, BKL is not a small airfield. Its main runway is 6,604 feet. For comparison, the two runways at NY LaGuardia are 7,002 feet; the longest of four runways at Chicago Midway is 6,445 feet.

2. BKL is the hub for the Cleveland Clinic's fleet of jets. Cleveland Clinic is the largest employer in Cleveland, and a large driver of, and contributor to, the local economy and image of the city. Dedicated air ambulance planes provide critical and timely patient and organ transport and has served patients from more than 20 countries and 40 states. In the Clinic's own words: "No patient too sick, no patient too far." Using a ground ambulance (vs helicopter) to transport an organ or patient from BKL to the Clinic takes 15 minutes, at normal traffic speeds. The next closest airport is Cleveland Hopkins International (CLE) at 22 minutes. However, there is more than a seven minute difference between the two from aircraft landing to arrival at the Clinic, as landing at Hopkins requires more time to obtain clearance to land given the higher volume of traffic landing and departing, as well as significantly more taxi time after landing. (A second, replacement airport is often cited, Cuyahoga County Airport; the county airport is even further away from the Clinic than Hopkins and has shorter runways than BKL, reducing safety margins.). A second major hospital, University Hospitals, also uses Burke for patient and organ transport.
3. Though not part its name (just as with LaGuardia), BKL can and does handle international flights, and the airport is fully certified for federal inspection services (customs and border protection).
4. BKL is a designated reliever airport for CLE, and the most capable of all relievers to Hopkins Airport (runway capacity, terminal size and facilities, ARFF [emergency services], etc.), which is critical for day-to-day operations at Hopkins to minimize non-commercial traffic at the region's primary airport. As no designated reliever for Cleveland Hopkins can match (or exceed) the capabilities of BKL, a closure of BKL will undermine the safety of the US flying public. Approximately 10M US and international passengers annually who use CLE would be impacted.
5. Advocates for Burke closure frequently cite the former Chicago Meigs Field, which was closed by Chicago Mayor Daley in 2003, as a similar airport to BKL. Other than being adjacent to water, there is no comparison. Chicago Midway was—and remains—Chicago's secondary airport (and with shorter runways than Burke). Meigs was a tiny airport with a 3,900-foot runway. Hence, closing Burke would be more akin to closing Midway.

### **Major Environmental Issues**

6. Burke Airport is environmentally toxic. Substantial parts of the airport were built on unregulated waste—to include household, municipal, and commercial landfill. Former streetcar tracks and bus tires are buried within. Previous soil borings at the airport showed the "load bearing" substrata begins around 75 feet below the soil's surface indicating potentially profound levels of waste that comprise the area beneath the airfield as Burke is 450 acres. When runway and taxi lights were installed at BKL which required underground electrical work, the electricians wore full hazmat suits given the levels of sub-surface toxicity.
7. Costs for remediation by excavation and removal, the recommended method if the land will be built on, range between \$32,000 and \$80,000 per acre-foot, depending on contamination level. If we apply these values modestly, say only 250 acres out of BKL's 450 are contaminated and only to an average depth of 40 feet, the resulting costs would be between \$320M and \$800M.
8. Even if only a park is built and no hotel, retail, or housing, remediation will still be required given the profound public health risks to people spending time at the park. Even with warning signs about cancer and birth defects, it would be unlikely that such a park would be allowed to legally, or at least ethically, open.

### **Adjacent Vacant Land Undeveloped for Decades and Profound Development & Financing Challenges**

9. The likelihood that a developer would be willing to pay \$320M-\$800M to clean the contaminated land and then pay for costs to build a project is laughable as immediately west of the airport is

open, vacant, lakefront land that is more centrally located to Downtown Cleveland than is Burke and the city has been unable to successfully develop it for decades.

10. Moreover, as the Cleveland Browns plan to move to the suburbs, they will be leaving their home on the lakefront west of the airport. The city plans to dismantle the existing 67,000 seat stadium, meaning, in addition to the open, vacant land that has been available for decades, an additional 16 acres will be available.
11. Hence, there is no shortage of vacant, unused land on the Downtown Cleveland waterfront. Closing Burke will only add more, unused vacant land Downtown. And the airport land is likely to stay vacant and unused for decades, if not forever, given the environmental conditions, unless Congress or some other body is willing to pay for cleaning the site.
12. Typically, a developer would want government to pay for environmental cleanup costs rather than pay for such themselves, which is a heavy burden on government, particularly when the land was previously serving an economic purpose and there was no true, compelling need to end that use. Additionally, obtaining bank financing for a project with \$320M and \$800M in remediation costs on top of ground lease and construction costs, is unlikely in a market like Cleveland that cannot demand New York City or San Francisco-level rents that enable an ROI in 7-10 years.

**Cleveland desperately needs economic and business growth. BKL gives Cleveland a competitive edge and business traffic is currently growing.**

13. Cities compete fiercely with each other, including offering millions in subsidies or tax credits to attract new companies and jobs. Cleveland also faces other challenges in this space to include limited international air service, a high poverty rate, a generally negative reputation, and steady loss of global prestige. But one asset Cleveland has that almost no other US city has: a very capable airport so centrally located to its central business district. Closing Burke eliminates a competitive edge that Cleveland possesses, which the city desperately needs, that if managed and developed properly, which is not being done under the Bibb Administration, could enable the city's growth and further its economic competitiveness.
14. The ease of travel for business is what will enable to Cleveland to grow, resulting in more jobs and opportunities and a larger population. At Burke, despite the city's efforts to suppress traffic, business travel is increasing, not decreasing. The traffic segment that matters most to growing the city's economy is itinerant flight activity by air carriers and what the FAA calls "air taxis," which are planes for hire carrying 60 or fewer passengers. Comparing the most recently complete year, 2024, to the last full year before COVID, 2019, flights in these categories are up a combined 25.1%. Comparing 2023 to 2019, flights are up 18.2%. This growth is substantial. However, these critical data points are obscured if one is instead presented with broad general aviation data that is heavily skewed to recreational pilots on propellers vs. business or medical flights in jets, which are the true economic drivers. It's clearly not the time to close an airport while business traffic is trending up strongly, feeding and growing the economy of the city.

**Bibb's "studies" are flawed by design while his administration turns away an airline, and suppresses airline competition impacting Cleveland and all US travelers**

15. The City of Cleveland owns and operates Burke Airport. As such, the city controls whether an airline may serve BKL. The city also controls both actual investment and the environment for investment. The city could readily improve or enable a carrier to improve facilities at BKL—which would be at no cost to taxpayers—but chooses not to. The city's continual public threat to close the airport discourages investments by others who would otherwise invest in assets and services at the airport.
16. Any passenger growth or airline activity at BKL hurts Bibb's narrative that Burke should be closed.

17. Avelo Airlines, a relatively new airline, currently in approximately 50 cities, wanted to serve Cleveland at Burke Lakefront—not Hopkins—as it aligned with their growth strategy. The airline would have brought direct, nonstop service to a city not currently served from Cleveland, as well as plans for other cities. No gate improvements were required. But the Bibb Administration flatly denied them access to Burke. By denying new carriers at Burke, it furthers the Administration's "case" to close the airport while misleading the public about true airliner demand at Burke and simultaneously hurts the city by denying new unserved routes from materializing, reducing airline competition (resulting in higher prices) for residents and businesses, and precludes new local jobs from being created by the new airline along with related indirect and induced employment. (After rejection, Avelo ended up bypassing Cleveland and set up their regional operations in Detroit instead.)
18. It is a core element of USDOT and the United States to foster competition, and airline competition is core tenant of USDOT and DOJ—whether examining airline slots per country on a bilateral agreement or when contemplating US airline mergers or code share agreements that will reduce competition for a US city. The denial of Avelo unquestionably hurt US travelers and US businesses (including, of course, those in Cleveland) not only by restricting a carrier from the city which planned to grow to numerous routes, but also by preventing non-stop service on a route that is currently unserved from the Cleveland region, thereby costing travelers on both ends of the city pair additional hours and related costs for a trip by requiring a connection. Moreover, the broader economic development opportunities for both cities that are stimulated by a new, non-stop route are also lost.
19. Bibb openly stated his desire to close Burke. While campaigning for mayor in 2021, it seems, he was (wisely) advised to have a more neutral stance as the topic was controversial. He then shifted and promised "an honest conversation about the future of Burke." He then commissioned two studies that were anything but an "honest conversation." Both studies looked at closing Burke.
  - a. One study, performed by CHA Consulting, directly states, "This airport closure alternative study supplements the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) narrative report by evaluating the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements to close Burke Lakefront Airport (BKL). The goal of this analysis is not to provide a recommendation on whether the City of Cleveland (Airport Sponsor) should or should not close the airport but rather an overview of the requirements, potential financial or legal implications, and its effect on its stakeholders." In other words, it was not an assessment about the airport's role or potential, rather, it was a study on "how to close the airport" and even has "Closure" in the title. It's a hardly an earnest, "honest conversation" about the future of Burke.
  - b. The other study, led by Econsult Solutions Inc. (ESI), was titled, "Valuing Burke Lakefront Airport: Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis". This study examined and compared the "the current economic and fiscal impacts of BKL, the economic and fiscal impacts that would be lost if BKL were closed, and the economic and fiscal impacts of three alternative development scenarios for the BKL site." In other words, per its assignment, it compared a Burke Airport that has discouraged investment and denied commercial air service to other scenarios that does allow investment—one of which included a "100-room hotel, 1,200 residential units, [and] 100,000 SF of retail." And the authors were careful to note, "This analysis does *not* incorporate the potential environmental remediation costs." And the report does not make any recommendations on the four scenarios it compared.
20. Three critical points: 1) Neither consultant study recommended closure (as doing so would likely negatively impact their national credibility); 2) no study was ever commissioned that looked at how different levels of investment in the airport—or even policy changes to improve the airport rather focus on its destruction—would impact Cleveland and the region. How does a Burke Airport with minimal investment—or one that does not turn away growing airlines—compare with the other scenarios contemplated?; and, 3) the fact that the city controls the airport and can (and does) drive away passenger air service compromises any study that examines "current BKL where

improvements are not allowed” to scenarios with heavy amounts of new investments, and asks, ‘which is better?’ is inherently flawed. It’s a classic example of comparing apples and oranges.

21. To be clear, the consultants’ studies were complete with respect to what they were asked to do; it’s what they were asked to look at that was disingenuous to the public interest. Neither study was commissioned to give an “honest” assessment of the potential of Burke Lakefront vs the potential of other uses; and neither study looked at the extensive environmental remediation required before any new use could be developed.

### **Burke Doesn’t Cost Taxpayers a Dime**

22. While Burke adds significant benefit to the city, it operates at no cost to taxpayers, as the city’s two airports comprise an enterprise fund and function as an “airport system.” Any operating deficits are covered by revenues at Hopkins, given the benefits of Burke to passengers at Hopkins. BKL enables the separation of traffic, giving smaller, general aviation aircraft an alternative to Hopkins. That need, thoughtfully envisioned by the planners of Burke, is still true today. Moreover, Burke supports on-time performance for scheduled airliners by minimizing Hopkins congestion and makes for safer skies over Cleveland.
23. If the airport is closed and is successfully developed, tax revenue from the hotels and shops (if more than a park is built) could partially fund the costs of new streets and infrastructure, and the related operations and maintenance. However, if the land is never developed, which is the more likely environmental scenario unless studies that have yet to be commissioned suggest otherwise, BKL will be a drain on taxpayers given the large costs to secure and maintain a large, chain-linked fenced-off area of 450 acres that may likely become a new, unauthorized dumping ground that the city will need to continuously clean and maintain.

### **New Potential Impacts to Cleveland Hopkins Necessitates the Need for Burke for Emergencies and Disruptions**

24. Burke will soon becoming even more important. The Cleveland Browns currently play at a stadium adjacent to BKL. They are planning to move to the suburb of Brook Park, which Bibb signed off on, despite the millions of lost revenue to the city, to Downtown businesses, and, on game or event days, negative impacts to Hopkins Airport which will be adjacent to the new stadium. The impacts to Hopkins Airport will at least be landside issues with on-airport and off-airport parking being used (expected to be substantially cheaper than at the new stadium) leaving no parking for travelers and delayed access to the airport itself via car as the limited roads that surround the stadium also serve CLE and are expected to be very congested. The new stadium will also be only about 2300 feet east of Runway 10-28 and 221 feet above ground. Though the FAA has not objected to this proximity and height, enabling the project to proceed, it is nonetheless a major physical structure so close to the airfield that in an emergency situation could have grave consequences. Also, a major security event at the stadium may readily affect operations at Hopkins Airport. The true aviation and air service impacts at Hopkins that will result from the new stadium being constructed so close to CLE are yet to be seen. (Bibb withdrew the city’s lawsuit blocking the construction after some money was promised by the owners of the Browns, which is an amount that is far less than the total financial and future spin-off development gains that Cleveland would have had otherwise.) However, given the new potential air system and landside disruptions at Hopkins as a result of the new stadium, Burke will have a new, profound role of importance for the city and the national airspace system, particularly in the first five or ten years of the new stadium as CLE and the new stadium’s co-existence and public behavior and response normalizes.
25. New stadium issues aside, Burke is a natural spot for any emergency landing for flights departing Hopkins on Runway 6L and 6R which are a common departure direction (flying to the Northeast towards Downtown). The runways at BKL are exactly aligned to 6L and 6R CLE departures such that, in an emergency, if a plane can make it the 11 miles from runway to runway, Hopkins to Burke, the plane can have a safe place to land at a well-equipped airport.

## **Nonsensical Claims**

26. Bibb's letter states: "Cleveland and Cuyahoga County are committed to working through this [closure] process responsibly together, ensuring that critical general aviation needs — such as medical transport and business travel — can be absorbed by Cleveland Hopkins International, Cuyahoga County Airport, and other regional facilities. In doing so, the overall aviation system will be strengthened...." This makes no sense. Adding general aviation traffic—to include less experienced and slower-moving aircraft—into the mix with commercial aviation traffic at Hopkins does not strengthen the "overall aviation system" rather it adds congestion and compromises safety and would negatively impact the nation's air system and airlines' on time performance. Moreover, adding general aviation traffic to smaller general aviation airports around the region without new investments in those airports and/or landside access to/from those airports does not in any way "strengthen" the "overall aviation system".

## **More brain developmental issues for children**

27. Bibb states other airports in the Cleveland region can absorb the existing general aviation traffic currently at BKL. All of these airports (including Hopkins) are surrounded by suburban-style residential communities. Almost all general aviation uses high-octane leaded fuel (100LL fuel) while commercial aviation does not. The EPA states: "The science is clear: exposure to lead can cause irreversible and life-long health effects in children...aircraft that use leaded fuel are the dominant source of lead emissions in our air." With Burke's water approaches and departures, BKL's impact from general aviation for air inhalation by children is mitigated. Pushing more general aviation to Hopkins Airport and to Cuyahoga County Airport, Lorain County Airport, Lake County Executive Airport, and other small landlocked airports will certainly increase damaging health effects to children living near those airports.

## **Need for "Real" Studies before any Actions are Taken**

28. As Burke is already existing and serving a useful economic purpose, the questions about Burke should be, how can Burke be improved to serve more people and serve the city and region better? Ideally, the city should be looking to grow and prosper, not "give up" and close an airport that would facilitate growth.
29. However, to examine the full range of possible options for the future of the city, for any substantive discussion about Burke Airport, let alone FAA rulings or legislation related to the airport, real, unbiased studies must be completed. These studies must assess:
- a. What a properly managed Burke Lakefront Airport could do for the city, not one managed by an administration intentionally suppressing its value and attempting to close the airport despite its benefits to the city and region. Such a study should include analyses on different levels of capital investment and operating improvements (and be managed by a party other than the Bibb Administration).
  - b. Estimate, if the airport were to be closed, the true cost of environmental remediation and identify the parties willing to pay for it. Even if the estimate turned out to be far lower than cited above, say "only" \$250M, if there are no parties forthcoming to pay that amount, then the airport will sit as vacant land, costing the city taxpayers to fence off and maintain it, and the city will have lost an important economic asset for nothing.
  - c. Countless plans for the lakefront have been developed over the decade. A true plan with actual funders would be required that estimates the cost of the project for developers, identifies the developers (and their credit worthiness), and determines the cost to the public sector to include access, electricity, water, sewerage, roads, road maintenance, street lights, police patrols, snow removal, garbage removal, street maintenance, park maintenance, and other costs. Also, Burke Airport is cut off from the rest of the city by the Shoreway, an eight-lane highway. The two connection points for access are E. 9 Street and E. 55 Street, which are 2.7 miles apart. If BKL is truly to be a new development for

Clevelanders—whether as a park or housing and retail, greater access to the area would be required, meaning additional bridges over the eight-lane Shoreway, at least along the 1.8-mile route along N. Marginal Rd. between E. 9 St. and E. 40 St. near the southeast section of Burke. These long-span bridges will be very expensive and will require maintenance costs beyond the capital construction costs and should be included in any cost analyses.

- d. Any plan that is used to justify airport closure should be fully fundable, but also compelling and substantial. In the ESI study, the company looked at three levels of development in their “future development scenarios”, being “Minimal,” “Maximum,” and “Hybrid.” The “Maximum” development called for a 170-acre park, 30 acres of playing fields, a 100-room hotel, 1200 residential units, and 100,000 SF of retail. Such little development hardly seems worth the profound impact on the city for losing an airport, especially after spending \$320M-\$800M on environmental remediation. Development must be substantial: a whole new neighborhood, with parks, a few thousand hotel rooms, 12,000-15,000 housing units, schools, a library, a fire station, and retail; that may be a compelling vision. But the “Maximum” development level presented is certainly not worth the loss of Burke Airport.
- e. Policy. Every major city in the world has more than one airport. If Cleveland is to “give up” its potential return to being a major city, and remain complacent with “middle tier” or “middle market” status, then it should, upon study of the related implications, formalize mediocrity as policy, as a decision to close BKL would be consistent with that policy.

30. Bibb’s letter asking for “explicit Congressional authorization” suggests he’s not offering or suggesting any real analysis—even a practical estimate of what environmental remediation would cost so that BKL doesn’t end up a fenced-off, new garbage dump if closed. He wants, “a formal roadmap and timeline for closure”. Evasion of common sense would be detrimental to the city and preclude its future possibilities.

Bibb should be recognized for wanting to make a positive change to the city’s waterfront. Such a change could be a fresh look at Burke—with new investments in the airport combined with a new policy approach to better leverage the airport for economic growth—or possibly a new, non-airport use like a new city neighborhood with hotels, housing, retail, and a large park. We would be happy to work with him to ensure any next steps are done thoughtfully and consider a broader perspective of current issues.

However, closing Burke Airport—or drafting legislation for closure—without proper studies—such as how a properly managed Burke Airport could be leveraged to grow the city or the cost of environmental remediation before a single non-airport use can be safely developed and identifying who would pay for such—would be wholly irresponsible, could endanger the US flying public, and could be permanently detrimental for the city of Cleveland and the region.

Accordingly, without having real, comprehensive information about Burke options, noting the value of Burke Lakefront Airport to Cleveland and the US commercial aviation system, and having only Bibb’s disingenuously-designed studies, we hereby request you deny Bibb’s request for “partnership and support” that would, based on the information available thus far, hurt the people and economy of Cleveland.

Sincerely,  
The Center for Cleveland

The Center for Cleveland is a non-profit, bipartisan economic development organization focused on economic and population growth of the city of Cleveland. We have no financial interests in any organization or business at or serving Burke Lakefront Airport. Our perspective and analysis on airports, the city’s connectivity via air service, and Cleveland’s global competitiveness relative to other cities support our mission of economic and population growth of Cleveland and the region.

Attachment: Letter from Cleveland Mayor Justin Bibb and Cuyahoga County Executive Chris Ronayne, dated October 22, 2025.

cc:

Ted Cruz, Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, & Transportation  
Sam Graves, Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure  
John Mayfield, FAA Detroit Airports District Office  
Blaine Griffith, President, Cleveland City Council  
Michael D. Polensek, Cleveland City Council-Ward 8  
Tony Lefebvre, President and CEO, Signature Aviation  
Scott Grubbs, General Manager, Signature Aviation-BKL  
George Katsikas, President and CEO, Aitheras Aviation Group



October 22, 2025

**The Honorable Sean Duffy**  
Secretary of Transportation  
U.S. Department of Transportation

**The Honorable Bernie Moreno**  
United States Senator

**The Honorable Jon Husted**  
United States Senator

**The Honorable Shontel M. Brown**  
United States Representative

**Re: Support to Close Burke Lakefront Airport and Unlock Cleveland's  
Downtown Lakefront**

Dear Secretary Duffy, Senator Moreno, Senator Husted, and Representative Brown:

On behalf of the City of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County, we respectfully request your partnership and support to begin the formal process — working with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and regional stakeholders — of decommissioning Burke Lakefront Airport (BKL) and repurposing this uniquely situated, approximately 450-acre waterfront site for public access and job-creating development.

This is a once-in-a-century opportunity for Ohio. We have a historic opportunity to assemble a continuous downtown waterfront that can accelerate the promise of unobstructed shoreline access, economic vitality, and world-class design. Closing Burke will create a lakefront that is accessible to all and make Cleveland competitive with the world's most dynamic waterfront cities.

For decades, Burke has consumed a vast stretch of lakefront land while aviation activity has steadily declined. What was once envisioned as a flourishing reliever airport is today an underutilized airfield with a fraction of its former traffic. The limited benefits it provides no longer outweigh the opportunity costs of keeping nearly 450 acres of prime downtown waterfront walled off from public use and economic growth. Repurposing this land will unlock transformative potential — parks and trails along the lake and new development opportunities that could deliver billions in long-term impact for the city, county, region, and state.



We recognize this move requires federal partnership and compliance with FAA regulations, including environmental review, resolution of grant assurances, and careful planning to accommodate necessary aeronautical activity elsewhere in the region. Cleveland and Cuyahoga County are committed to working through this process responsibly together, ensuring that critical general aviation needs — such as medical transport and business travel — can be absorbed by Cleveland Hopkins International, Cuyahoga County Airport, and other regional facilities. In doing so, the overall aviation system will be strengthened as the downtown lakefront is opened for new public and economic uses.

At the same time, while the FAA has the authority to approve a closure under existing law, we believe explicit Congressional authorization would provide certainty, accelerate the timeline, and eliminate any ambiguity that could delay progress. Federal legislation affirming the right to close Burke Lakefront Airport would send a strong signal of unified support and demonstrate alignment in unlocking this extraordinary asset for the benefit of the region.

For these reasons, we respectfully ask for your partnership. We request that the Department of Transportation collaborate with Cleveland on a formal roadmap and timeline for closure, and that our Congressional delegation reinforce this effort by urging FAA action and considering authorization language that affirms the city's ability to decommission Burke Airport.

We deeply appreciate your support for lakefront redevelopment to date. With your leadership, we can deliver a nationally significant waterfront district — one that drives economic growth, expands public access to Lake Erie, and creates opportunities for generations to come. We look forward to accelerating this vision together.

We look forward to working with you on next steps.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A blue ink signature of Justin M. Bibb, written in a cursive style.

**Justin M. Bibb**  
Mayor of Cleveland

A black ink signature of Chris Ronayne, written in a cursive style.

**Chris Ronayne**  
Cuyahoga County Executive